

117. "THE INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENTS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES HAVE A GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY TO . . . PROTECT . . . THE PEOPLES OF THIS HEMISPHERE FROM ANY EXTENSION OF THE TREACHERY OF *FIDELISMO*": Statement Made by the U.S. Representative (Morrison) Before the Council of the OAS, December 4, 1961³⁹

This is a critical moment for the inter-American system. At our meeting on November 14 we agreed to set this date on which to act on the proposal of the Government of Colombia.⁴⁰ In the intervening 3 weeks we have all had an ample opportunity to consult our governments and to exchange views on how best to proceed in accomplishing the objectives of the Colombian initiative. From these conversations it is clear that a considerable majority of the American governments recognizes the pressing need for a meeting of foreign ministers to consider the dangerous situation created by the intervention of international communism in this hemisphere facilitated by the Castro regime's now publicly proclaimed alinement with the Sino-Soviet bloc. While most of the governments comprising this considerable majority, including my own, favor moving ahead with the Colombian proposal as presented, a few continue to be concerned over the juridical basis for such a Meeting of Consultation.

My Government from the outset has maintained that the threat which confronts all the American Republics today is clearly a matter which appropriately should be dealt with under the Rio Treaty.⁴¹ The threat is not abstract but actual. It is not in the future but real and present. The principal elements of the threat are Cuba's proclaimed alinement with the extracontinental system of international communism and its declared purpose and known efforts to extend that system to other countries of the hemisphere through agitation, subversion, and civil strife. There is not a country here represented that to one degree or another has not felt the impact of the Castro regime's interventionist activities.

This situation is without doubt an "urgent matter of common concern" as stated in article 39 of the charter. But it is much more than that. It is clearly a situation which not only *might* but actually *does* endanger the peace of America as contemplated in article 6 of the Rio Treaty. And for those who in these circumstances place such importance on the grammatical construction of article 6, I would add that this situation, involving as it does flagrant subversion, endangers and thus affects the political independence of the American states.

The United States delegation report on the Quitandinha conference,⁴² which was referred to in the meeting on November 14, in our

³⁹ Department of State press release No. 840 (text as printed in the Department of State *Bulletin*, Dec. 25, 1961, pp. 1069-1071).

⁴⁰ See OAS doc. OEA/Ser.G/III/C-sa-422 and the unnumbered title, *ante*, p. 318.

⁴¹ Text in *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, pp. 789-796.

⁴² *Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security, Quitandinha, Brazil, August 15-September 2, 1947: Report of the Delegation of the United States of America* (Department of State publication 3016).

opinion makes abundantly clear the very broad scope of article 6 when it states:

... the procedures and obligations in article 6 are declared to be operative whenever:

- a. The inviolability or integrity of the territory;
- b. the sovereignty; or [and I stress the word "or"]
- c. the political independence of any American State is affected by:
 1. An act of aggression other than an armed attack;
 2. An extracontinental or intracontinental conflict; or [and I again stress the "or"]
 3. Any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America.

"The reference to 'any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America,'" continues the report, "was considered by the framers to be sufficiently broad to include most if not all of the occasions specified in the various proposals [made during the Conference] as calling for consultation." Among these proposals was one advanced by Uruguay covering the "violation of the essential rights of man or the departure from the democratic system" as requiring "the joint and voluntary action of the countries of the continent."

My delegation is thoroughly convinced that the history of the formulation, as well as the precise language, of article 6 fully supports the juridical soundness of the Colombian initiative in calling for the meeting of foreign ministers to be held under the Rio Treaty. Furthermore, the nature of the danger which faces us is such that the need for collective action under the Rio Treaty confronts the Organization of American States with its foremost immediate challenge. My Government enthusiastically supports the resolution proposed by the Government of Colombia.

Now I should like to say a few words about the basic issue before the Council. This issue, which has come into much sharper focus during the past 3 weeks, is the intervention of an extracontinental, totalitarian system in this hemisphere, using Castro's Cuba as a base. Dr. Castro, with his well-timed speech of December 1,⁴ has now, finally, removed any doubts about this. The issue was already, of course, quite clear, but it is always helpful to have it defined by the protagonist himself. Incidentally, such an abrupt revelation by the maximum leader of the revolution of a conviction long held may catch some members of his supporting cast unawares, but they will quickly recognize that sudden about-faces are inherent in the Communist system. We have all watched with amusement in recent weeks, for example, Communities parties throughout the world trying to rationalize the de-Stalinization program of Khrushchev.

Castro's speech of December 1 is a remarkably candid confession of intrigue and deception by a man who for close to 10 years studiously hid his real political orientation. Now he tells us that he was basically influenced by Marxist-Leninist theory when he was in the university, that his revolutionary thinking was well formed by the time of his

⁴ Text in the *New York Times*, Dec. 3, 1961.

"History Will Absolve Me" speech in 1953," and that some of the ideas in that statement were deliberately disguised so as not to affect adversely his movement. Now he boasts of taking the help of other revolutionary groups during the struggle against Batista, while opposing efforts at unity until he could gain the upper hand. He makes clear that the same cynical considerations, underlay the establishment of a moderate government during his first months in power while he went about consolidating his apparatus. With startling frankness, he states that, if his radical views had been known, those opposed to him today would have been fighting him from the very start. This is the record of a man who deceived the Cuban people who had placed their trust in him and betrayed a revolution that was welcomed and admired the world over. This is something for those to ponder who are still tempted to believe that temporizing with Communist tactics is likely to be successful or that freedom and independence are not constantly endangered by the Communist movement.

Castro also made clear that he has chosen the path of communism, via socialism, traced by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. He said:

"In effect, we had to apply scientific socialism. That is why I began to tell you with all candor that we believe in Marxism, that we believe that it is the most correct, most scientific, the only true theory, the only true revolutionary theory. Yes, I state it here, with complete satisfaction and with full confidence. I am a Marxist-Leninist and I will continue to be a Marxist-Leninist until the last day of my life.

One is reminded of his promises made some time ago to return Cuba to the path of individual liberty and representative democracy, when at his Moncada trial in 1953 he proclaimed:

"The first revolutionary law will return to the people their sovereignty and proclaim the Constitution of 1940 as the true supreme law of the State until such times as the people decide to modify or change it."

In the early days of his regime, Dr. Castro told the Cuban people that his revolution was *tan cubana como las palmas*. He used to say: *La revolución cubana no es roja sino verde olivo*. He described *fidelismo* as neither capitalism nor communism but *humanismo*. He liked to say that capitalism was *libertad sin pan* and communism was *pan sin libertad*. *Humanismo*, he said, meant *pan con libertad*. And now he further mocks the Cuban people by telling them that if they are frightened over the prospects of being led down the road to communism, they really should not be worried, as it will take 30 years of socialism to get there.

Despite all the disclaimers, Dr. Castro likewise clarifies again his design for Latin America by proclaiming that guerrilla warfare will work in other nations of this hemisphere if they will but try it. Castro's "guerrilla warfare" is synonymous with Khrushchev's "wars of national liberation" through which international communism pro-

* Speech of Oct. 16, 1953, before the Emergency Session of the Court of Santiago de Cuba; English-language text published in 1959 by the Liberal Press, New York, under the title *History Will Absolve Me*.

** See p. 35 of the source cited in the preceding footnote.

poses to undermine and destroy established governments and extend its influence throughout the world.

Dr. Castro has now lifted his personal mask, revealing the treachery of his rise to power. He has at last personally and publicly aligned himself, as well as his regime, with the Sino-Soviet bloc, prescribing his formula for extending Castro-communism throughout the hemisphere. In doing this, he again has emphasized a fundamental truth regarding communism; namely, that wherever it has seized power and whenever it retains control, it has done so on the basis of deceit and oppression, destroying individual freedom and flouting the will of the majority of the people.

It is well that we contemplate carefully this record. Castro's Marxist-Leninist regime advocates economic and social change in our hemisphere through violence and oppression. Our governments, through the Bogotá and Punta del Este charters,⁴⁶ have chosen to work toward the same objectives of economic and social change within the framework of liberty, national independence, and respect for individual rights. Are we now to defend the course which we have chosen against those who impede our forward march through agitation and subversion? My delegation firmly believes that the independent governments of the Organization of American States have a grave responsibility to act collectively to protect the sovereignty and political independence of the peoples of this hemisphere from any extension of the treachery of *fidelismo* and to let the Cuban people know that they are not alone and that they are not abandoned in their struggle to regain their God-given freedom.

118. CONVOCATION OF A MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS "TO CONSIDER THE THREATS TO . . . THE POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE AMERICAN STATES . . . FROM THE INTERVENTION OF EXTRACONTINENTAL POWERS": Resolution Approved by the Council of the OAS, December 4, 1961⁴⁷

**THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES,
CONSIDERING:**

The note presented by the Delegation of Colombia, dated November 9, 1961,⁴⁸ in which it requests the convocation of a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, in accordance with Article 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,⁴⁹ to consider the threats to the peace and to the political independence of the American states that might arise from the intervention of extra-continental powers directed toward breaking American solidarity,

⁴⁶ Texts in *American Foreign Policy: Current Documents, 1960*, pp. 293-299; and *post*, doc. 146.

⁴⁷ OAS doc. OEA/Ser.G/III/C-aa-427 (2).

⁴⁸ Cited as an unnumbered title, *ante*, p. 318.

⁴⁹ Text in *American Foreign Policy, 1950-1955: Basic Documents*, pp. 789-796.